

and we will be at the end of the fiscal year, with miles to go and much to do in order to fulfill our most basic responsibility, and that is to pass 13 appropriations bills.

As co-chair of the Women's Caucus, along with the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. NANCY JOHNSON), I am pleased that the House has gotten through four of the seven priority bills chosen by the Women's Caucus. That brings credit to this House. I hope that the House also will bring itself credit by the way it treats the capital of the United States.

The District's appropriation is one of those left hanging and unresolved. The city is not a Federal agency, and when it is on tenterhooks wondering whether its appropriation will go through or, as in the case of the CR, held to last year's spending limits, a living, breathing city suffers.

The problem with our bill comes from 10 hours during which attachments of every kind were put on our bill, attachments at war with the democratically voiced views of the residents of the District of Columbia: Adoption forbidden for unmarried couples, even though we have children languishing in foster care; vouchers once again put on our appropriation, although the President had not 3 months prior vetoed such a bill; a police helicopter of the Park Service funded out of D.C. funds; advisory neighborhood commissions defunded entirely, though they are the lifeline of neighborhood life in the District of Columbia to keep the services coming at the neighborhood level. The District deserves better.

This Friday, the District is about to break ground on a new convention center funded entirely by the private sector. Most such centers in this country are funded with public funds.

The schools have shown enormous progress. We now have perhaps more charter schools per capita than any other jurisdiction in the United States. We had a magnificent summer school called Summer Stars. To make sure that we eliminate social promotion, children went not only to catch up but to get ahead. Test scores were up significantly on the Stanford 9 even before summer school—scores up in every grade.

We have a new vigorous control board that is keeping the District's feet to the fire and preparing the District for the return of home rule. This is a city that has come back. We have just had an election with fresh leadership promised next year, vigorous new leadership committed to getting the city's House in total order, even more than is being done now.

This is the kind of progress that one would think that the Congress would want to encourage. Ten hours of attachments to our appropriation did just the opposite. It dispirited residents who have suffered greatly in the past few years and have taken great pride that their city is coming up and coming alive.

This is a time for the House and the Senate to encourage the capital, it is not the time to punish the residents of the Nation's capital. By October 1st we hope that this body will have shown that it does indeed take pride in the progress the Nation's capital is beginning to make.

#### ISSUES THAT CONCERN AND SOMETIMES CONFUSE THE AMERICAN PUBLIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I come here today with some concerns. We all, over the weekend, had maybe time to watch the reporting of political events in America, and I come here, I guess, to speak to the people of this great country and to the people in my district about things that concern me; things that are going on in America today that concern all Americans.

There is in the political system today the effort by many, on both sides of the aisle, to put their spin out on what is happening in America. I guess the first point that bothers me is the spinning of all these issues. We want the American people to understand that we are here to do their business and to uphold the law. The American people, I believe, want justice and fairness. They want the laws of this country to be applied to all of us, equally. And sometimes, with all that is going on, we might find that the American public is confused about whether that is happening and whether, in fact, it will happen.

Our system works. We must give it time to work. I would like to say to people that I am talking about the debate here on the House floor, and the political rancor that sometimes seizes the Capitol and the parties. This is where we make our decision. This is where we decide where the compromise is. This is where we decide what is fair. We do not, any of us in this body, worry that we have to look down Pennsylvania Avenue and see tanks rolling up the street because someone in power decides that they are being unfairly treated by this body. This is where our system works.

The bottom line on the first point I want to make is, too much spin from any source, on any side, of what is going on in America today is wrong, and I believe and hope that the American people can see that.

The second point that I thought was brought up a lot on the Sunday talk shows dealt with attacks on the Congress. Some of those attacks came from the First Couple, attacks made mostly at fund-raising events around the country.

A little aside. My wife traveled to Washington on Friday evening, because we were in session, and her plane was delayed for several hours because of the arrival in Chicago of Air Force

One. That is disconcerting. This is one of the major airports in America, and we appear to have an imperialism that affects the chief executive. The rest of the country can cool their heels and wait while the First Family or the President comes in for a fundraiser. I think we should watch that in America.

We do not want an imperial presidency, we do not want maybe 1200 people going to China at the cost of \$40 million or more. We have to watch that. And it is very easy to get into a pattern where that becomes more and more the norm instead of the exception.

□ 1100

But some of the criticisms leveled at the Republican Congress dealt with education, improving education, affordable child care, expanding health care, protecting the environment, stabilizing the international economy.

I would just like to talk about each of those points for just a minute, to answer the criticism of the administration in regard to that.

Improving education. I would like to know what Dollars to the Classroom is, if that is not a big improvement to education. I can imagine that almost every teacher in America will be glad to see \$400 average go to their classroom for education. What we are doing with the reenactment and the renewal of the higher education bill is indeed very important. What we are doing with the \$500 child tax credit certainly makes child care more affordable.

Expanded health care. We passed a bill out of this House that provides more health care for more Americans than ever before, and we hope the Senate will soon move on that.

In closing, there is much been said about attacks on this Congress. I think there is much to be said for what we have done, and I appreciate the time to come here and speak about it.

#### HIGH CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I come here on the floor today to talk about the definition and the meaning of "high crimes and misdemeanors." The Constitution states that the "President and all civil officers of the United States shall be removed from office on impeachment for conviction of treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors."

This is the standard under which the House Judiciary Committee is currently evaluating Judge Starr's report. But Mr. Speaker, what exactly are high crimes and misdemeanors? To define "high crimes and misdemeanors" is to

get to the heart of the task of the Committee on the Judiciary. Constitutional provisions related to impeachment arise from English practice, wherein impeachment was employed to remove an official who had abused his office but was under the protection of the crown.

To answer that question, I looked to the intent of the framers of the Constitution. They envisioned a government where the only type of person who could achieve the office of the President would, by definition, be a virtuous person. Should a lack of virtue result, the impeachment process was designed to remedy resulting serious offenses against the public trust and our system of government.

In fact, James Madison said that the aim of the Constitution was to "prevent the degeneracy of our leaders. The method of this prevention is the impeachment process."

Our Founding Fathers adopted this view of impeachment from English law. In English law, the phrase "high crimes and misdemeanors" was used since the 14th century to address political crimes. This is over 600 years of history. Thus, the phrase "high crimes and misdemeanors" actually had nothing to do with criminal law. In the Federalist Papers, Hamilton described impeachment crimes as "those offenses which proceed from the misconduct of public men, or, in other words, from the abuse or violation of some public trust."

The report of the Committee on the Judiciary in the Nixon impeachment proceedings in 1974 rejected criminality as a necessary element of impeachment. Thus, impeachment is not a criminal proceeding. It charges only "political" crimes and imposes purely political punishments. Thus, one not need commit a crime to have committed an impeachable offense.

In defending the President, some say that the "treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors" language in Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution has a very narrow and precise meaning. And Democrats warn us that the framers of the Constitution would be appalled today if Americans deviated from the meaning they had in mind and impeached a President over something as minor, in their opinion, as sex and lies.

The reality is that the definition of "high crimes and misdemeanors" is a term which is open to significant interpretation in light of 600 years of history. So, eventually, the American people had the responsibility to ask themselves whether they are witnessing behavior unbecoming an American President and whether the law and simple decency have rightful places in the conduct of our leaders and public officials.

We work very hard to teach our children the difference between right and wrong. We must, therefore, insist on the same from our leaders. In this case, if impeachable offenses were commit-

ted, the President must be held accountable.

Furthermore, Congress has a constitutional duty to the public to investigate and remedy breaches of the public trust. Mr. Speaker, holding the President accountable would ensure that future holders of the office would also be held accountable. To neglect to do so would debase our Constitution.

In America, no one is above the law. As former Representative Peter Rodino, a Democrat from New Jersey, a House Judiciary Committee chairman during the Watergate hearings, said, "We cannot turn away, out of partisanship or convenience, from problems that are now our responsibility to consider."

Has the President demeaned the Office of the presidency? That is the question. If so, then we must consider impeachment. Let the courts decide after the impeachment process what punishment should apply thereafter.

#### SEEKING A NEW STRATEGY IN AMERICA'S WAR ON POVERTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, in listening to those who have discussed the matters before Congress regarding the President, I agree these are very pressing constitutional issues before us. Regrettably, the Presidential crisis has magnified the extremes in our political culture.

I have received troubling phone calls from both sides of the political spectrum. Those supporting the President suggest that Congress drop this matter immediately. And on the other side, detractors of the President demand that we force him immediately from office without receiving due process.

Like so many others across America, I believe there is a more reasonable approach that emphasizes the importance of following the Constitution. We must do our job, and at the end of the process, we must prove two things:

First, for the sake of all Americans, we must show that no man is above the law. Secondly, we must show for the sake of the President and the public servants that work in Washington, D.C., no public servant will be held "below the law." We must not hold the President or any official to a legally higher standard than any of us would face. Those are our challenges.

I wanted to come to this chamber today, though, to speak briefly about another Democrat, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) who today is holding meetings and going throughout the city of Washington, D.C., to address a crisis that is still press 35 years after the advent of the great society. That crisis is poverty, and that crisis of poverty still exists in Washington, D.C., and still exists across this country.

Sadly, it still is shocking to some people that poverty still exists. Reports suggests that poverty is eradicated, that it has been miraculously wiped away from the face of American civilization. Regrettably, this is not true.

Two forms of poverty still exist today. One is the poverty that we are familiar with, the poverty that we have grown up hearing about, about children living in squalor, experiencing hunger. But a second poverty exists that is a far more dangerous poverty. That is the poverty of indifference.

The situation in Washington, D.C., remains dire. The first time I came to this city I was shocked to see people living in the shadow of the United States Capitol living in poverty, crime-riddled neighborhoods. We were warned not to stray too far from the Capitol or the Mall after dusk. How did we get to such a place in the United States of America, within the shadow of our Nation's Capitol? Such a situation is not acceptable.

Washington has repeated its mistakes over the past 35 years by refusing to dare to make a difference. If inner cities faced a social ill, Washington tried to micromanage each such problem by creating huge, hulking bureaucracies. By taking money from Americans from Maine over to Hawaii, and by bringing that money to Washington, D.C., Congress has long suggested that it knows better than communities how to end the scourge of poverty. The war on poverty has almost exclusively been waged from inside the walls of federal bureaucracies.

Sadly, the centralized, bureaucratic approach has not worked for the past 40 years. It will not work for the next 40 years. Therefore, we have no other choice but to dare to create a new approach for the war on poverty.

"Insanity" is defined as doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result. That is what we have been doing in Washington, D.C. We continue to take money from across America, funnel it to bureaucracies, allow bureaucracies to singularly wage the war on poverty, and ignore the failings we have fostered.

Drive through the South Bronx and decide for yourself whether we are better off today than we were 40 years ago. Drive through South Central Los Angeles or Gary, Indiana, and ask that same question. Or drive 5 minutes from the Nation's Capitol and go through Anacostia, and then decide whether Anacostia is better off today than when we started our bureaucratic war on poverty 35 years ago. I would suggest to my colleagues things are not better today.

Bobby Kennedy once said, "This is the violence of institutions: indifference and inaction and slow decay. This is the violence that afflicts the poor, that poisons relations between men because their skins have different colors. This is the slow destruction of a child by hunger, and schools without books